

SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP COMMENTS
EUREKA, CA

<i>Date:</i> June 14, 2005 1:00-5:00 pm	<i>Location:</i> Eureka UC Agricultural Center 5630 South Broadway
<i>Meeting Purpose and Goals:</i>	To hear and record public comment on the Public Review Draft of the California Water Plan Update 2005
All meeting materials, including the PowerPoint presentation, are available on the California Water Plan website at: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/materials/index.cfm	

Presenters:

Kamyar Guivetchi, Manager, Statewide Water Planning, CA Department of Water Resources (DWR)
Austin McInerny, Facilitator, Center for Collaborative Policy, CA State University, Sacramento
Dwight Russell, Chief, Northern District, DWR
Arnold Whitridge, Advisory Committee member, Trinity County

Introduction: Format and Purpose

Austin McInerny, meeting facilitator, introduced the presenters and DWR staff and welcomed everyone to the first CA Water Plan Update 2005 Public Input Workshop in Eureka. He thanked the UC Cooperative Extension for providing the meeting facility. The purpose of the meeting was for the CA Department of Water Resources (DWR) to receive public input and to share ideas for the Public Review Draft of the CA Water Plan.

The workshop format was interactive. Participants sat in table groups. The meeting consisted of 3 presentations by Kamyar Guivetchi (DWR), each followed by group discussion at each table. Advisory Committee member Arnold Whitridge spoke on behalf of the CA Water Plan Update 2005 Advisory Committee, and DWR Northern District Chief Dwight Russell gave a presentation on the North Coast Report, which is located in Volume 3 of the CA Water Plan. Each table station had a DWR staff person who helped record the group discussion on a flipchart. Each table group chose a reporter among themselves who would summarize the group discussion to the entire audience on behalf of the group. Near the end of the meeting, time was reserved for individuals to orally present prepared statements. For detailed description of the format, see the “Working in Groups” handout.

Part 1 – Agenda Items A and B

A) Background & Overview / B) Comments from the Advisory Committee

This *Water Plan Update* is different than previous updates. It was prepared using a new process. There are many new features in the Water Plan. It will be continually updated as new information becomes available, and it presents a strategic plan and framework for action developed with substantial

stakeholder input. Kamyar Guivetchi spoke on the background and strategic planning process used in the Water Plan. Advisory Committee member Arnold Whitridge explained the *Advisory Committee View*, which a 4-page handout prepared by the Advisory Committee that summarizes the areas of agreement and points of disagreement among the 65-member Advisory Committee over the last four and a half years, as well as uncertainties remaining in the Water Plan.

Below is a summary of the comments made at the tables in response to these questions:

Thinking about the presentation on Background and Overview by DWR and Comments from the Advisory Committee, what are the things you:

Liked	Would Change	Don't Know, Have Questions About:
<p>Table 1:</p> <p>+ No comments.</p> <p>Table 2:</p> <p>+ No comments.</p>	<p>Table 1:</p> <p>Δ Include regional historic perspectives and existing conditions, damage to watersheds.</p> <p>Δ Include table of wild and scenic rivers; have dams in place.</p> <p>Table 2:</p> <p>Δ Put a “Lessons Learned” at the beginning of the document that shows what we have learned and what has happened since publication of the last several Water Plan Updates. Not just process but also implementation.</p>	<p>Table 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need mechanism for local interests (tribal, grassroots, etc.) to interact; communicate the informed of processes facilitate informed public knowledge. • Support needed infrastructure improvements. • Concerned about groundwater quality (an underlying problem, literally!). • The Water Plan needs to address Tribal water concerns and needs. • Concerned about using Eel River Water to expand agricultural vineyards. • What about Lake Earl – agricultural/urban water management? • Promote environmental justice. <p>Table 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about lack of oversight by the Regional Water Quality Control Board. • With the emphasis on collaboration in this Water Plan process, RWQCB should be involved.

Part 2 – Agenda Items C and D

C) California Water Today & Water Balance / D) Regional Reports

It is important for a strategic plan to have a clear description of current conditions and accomplishments. Chapter 3 of Volume 1 (Strategic Plan) is called “California Water Today.” As the largest chapter in Volume 1, it is intended to provide education and reference information. It gives general findings from both statewide and regional perspectives as well as the perspectives of different water use sectors (agriculture, urban, and environment). Volume 3 of the Water Plan has more detailed information on each of the 10 hydrologic regions (plus additional reports for Statewide, Mountain Counties, and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta), covering conditions, challenges, accomplishments, and future opportunities of the Region presented, as well as quantified water balances for supply and use. Kamyar Guivetchi presented slides on California Water Today and Eureka Workshop Comments – June 14, 2005

statewide water balances, and Northern District Chief Dwight Russell summarized the Volume 3 regional reports for the North Coast Region.

Below is a summary of the comments made at the tables in response to these questions:

Thinking about the description of California Water Today and the Regional Reports, what are the things you:

Liked	Would Change	Don't Know, Have Questions About:
<p>Table 1: No comments.</p> <p>Table 2: No comments.</p>	<p>Table 1: Δ No comments.</p> <p>Table 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Δ Add more discussion of Potter Valley Dam and use of Eel River Water to the Vol. 3 North Coast Regional Report. Δ Missing reclaimed water as a <u>source of water</u> (in graphs). Δ Increase Tribal water issues – include in the Scenarios. Δ Increase tribal participation. Δ State should have a well-recognized, centralized point of contact for tribes. Δ The State should recommend regulating water use by new development; this regulation should be site specific and consider regional differences. Δ Efforts should be focused on areas of weakness, should manage around the worst conditions, i.e. drought. Δ Add more analysis on drought solutions. Δ The Water Plan does not emphasize where the controversial areas are in the North Coast – include this information. Δ Show imports and exports of rivers, i.e....Rogue River, Eel River, Klamath River. Δ Seems that pieces of some rivers are missing in the map of the North Coast. Δ Recommend a groundwater law for California. Δ The Water Plan should emphasize that CA will run out of water. Δ The Water Plan needs to restore unregulated instream flows Δ Add a description of how different water categories relate to each other or not. This would help educate public to better understand the problem. Δ Include new sidebar: North Coast 	<p>Table 1: No comments.</p> <p>Table 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How is Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) involved in the process? • Concerned about the lack of higher level institutional involvement between RWQCB and DWR; RWQCB should be involved.

	<p>Integrated Regional Water Plan – Sonoma County, Humboldt County</p> <p>Δ Show how decisions on water rights and disposition affects local economies.</p> <p>Δ Mention water quality and water treatment problems specific to Yurok and Hoopa Indian tribes and other disadvantaged communities, i.e. logging camps</p> <p>Δ Need a chart showing responsibilities of various state agencies to clarify hierarchy and roles by region for Department of Health Services, Department of Water Resources, State Water Resources Control Board, and Regional Water Quality Control Boards; this would inform the public on who to contact for specific problems</p>	
--	--	--

Part 3 – Agenda Items E and F

E) Preparing for the Future (Scenarios) / F) Diversifying Responses (Strategies)

This *Water Plan Update 2005* recognizes that many things may alter water use between now and 2030. For that reason, the *Update* contains a description of several possible future scenarios. Uncertainty about future course or events creates a need for multiple options to address opportunities and challenges. Further, the Plan recognizes that one size does not fit all. Each Region will have specific requirements or needs that may not apply across the entire state. Implementing multiple options (diverse management strategies) allows planners and managers to adapt to a variety of circumstances. Volume 2: Resource Management Strategies has narrative descriptions of 25 different strategies available to water managers to help them reduce water demand, improve operational efficiency and transfers, increase water supply, improve water quality, and practice resource stewardship.

The Table Groups were given the opportunity to have table group discussions this time, but the participants decided to skip this discussion session and to conclude the meeting.

Thinking from the perspective of 2030, are there things about this approach to plan for the future you:

Part 4 Additional Public Comments

- Δ Increase public education on regional water issues.
- Δ Dislike facilitated meetings; not the best way to present information prefer traditional style meetings for people who are prepared.
- Δ Better advertisement and outreach needed to announce meetings for public views.
- Δ Add an evaluation and comparison between this and past Water Plan at public meetings.
- Δ Add a discussion of how recommendations and plans from previous Water Plans may or may not have been implemented.

- Δ Need a state-level contact to help facilitate local issues for less advantaged communities.
- Δ Need more people from North Coast region on the Advisory Committee.

Part 5 – Formal Public Comments (in order of presentation):

Members of the public were welcome to present statements in the formal style of a traditional public hearing. No members of the public registered to speak.

Part 6 – Closing

Kamyar and Austin thanked the audience for participating in the public comment workshop and for their comments. He reminded everyone that the public review period will last through July 22, to allow for 60 days since the release of the printed Public Review Draft document.

The final comment deadline is July 22.

Attendance:

Bob Gearheart, Humboldt State University
Denver Nelson
Rebecca Price-Hall, Student, Humboldt State University
G. Thame, Student
Margaret Taylor
Judy Tetrault

Staff:

Dona Calder, DWR
Xavier "Tito" Cervantes, DWR
Paul Dabbs, DWR
Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR
Todd Hillaire, DWR
Austin McInerny, CCP
Glen Pearson, DWR
Mark Rivera, DWR
Dwight P. Russell, DWR
Jessica Salinas, DWR
David Sumi, CCP